IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA

Civil Writ Petition No.1773 of 2002.

Date of decision:12.04.2007

State of H.P. & Another **….Petitioners**

Versus

Subhash Chand **….Respondent.**

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice Dev Darshan Sud,J.
The Hon'ble Mr.Justice Rajiv Sharma,J.

Whether approved for reporting ?[1]

For the Petitioners: **Mr.M.S. Chandel, Advocate General with Mr.Rajan Dewan, Additional Advocate General and Mr.J.K.Verma, Deputy Advocate General.**

For the Respondent: **None.**

Per Dev Darshan Sud,J.(Oral)

The State has filed the present writ petition against the order of the learned State Administrative Tribunal, passed in O.A. No.782 of 1990, decided on 9th May, 2000.

We have heard learned Deputy Advocate General appearing for the petitioners. On going through the order, we find that it was decided on a statement of fact made by the Additional Advocate General before the learned Administrative Tribunal to the effect that after the interim order passed by the Tribunal the respondent

---

[1] ***Whether the reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgement?***

was re-engaged and that the State did not want to terminate the services of the respondent.

Learned Deputy Advocate General, appearing for the State, submits that the statement was factually incorrect and that the respondent is no longer working with the Forest Department, but is employee with the H.P. Public Works Department, as per Annexure P-4. In other words, the statement made before the learned Tribunal is not correct. In case of any mistake, it is for the State to approach the Administrative Tribunal for appropriate directions. In any event, since the respondent is not working with the Forest Department they cannot make nay grievance of the order. The writ petition is, therefore, disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Dev Darshan Sud)
Judge.

April 12, 2007.
(aks)

(Rajiv Sharma)
Judge.